

Probabilistic cloning and signalling

Sibasish Ghosh,^{1,*} Guruprasad Kar,^{1,†} Samir Kunkri,^{2,‡} and Anirban Roy^{1,§}

¹*Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C. I. T. Campus, Taramani, Chennai 600113, India*

²*Physics and Applied Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203 B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108, India*

We give a proof of impossibility of probabilistic exact $1 \rightarrow 2$ cloning of any three different states of a qubit. The simplicity of the proof is due to the use of a surprising result of remote state preparation [M. -Yong Ye, Y. -Sheng Zhang and G. -Can Guo, quant-ph/0307027 (2003)]. The result is extended to higher dimensional cases for special ensemble of states.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Mn

An arbitrary quantum state can not be cloned exactly because of the no-cloning theorem [1]. However Duan and Guo showed that probabilistic exact cloning for the set of linearly independent state is possible [2]. It is known that if the quantum states can be cloned exactly then physical message can be sent superluminally. Hardy and Song showed that if probabilistic exact cloning of $(d+1)$ number of quantum states, in which any d number of states are linearly independent, is possible, then there will be signalling [3]. Pati showed that probabilistic exact cloning of four states $|\psi\rangle, |\psi^\perp\rangle, |\phi\rangle, |\phi^\perp\rangle$ of a two dimensional Hilbert space implies (probabilistic) signalling, as distinguishability of the two mixtures $\frac{1}{2}(P[|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle] + P[|\psi^\perp\rangle \otimes |\psi^\perp\rangle])$ and $\frac{1}{2}(P[|\phi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle] + P[|\phi^\perp\rangle \otimes |\phi^\perp\rangle])$ is probabilistically possible [4].

In this paper we show that probabilistic exact cloning of any three different states of a qubit implies (probabilistic) *signalling* in the sense, that one can extract more than 1 cbit message probabilistically by communicating 1 cbit only [5]. Here we use the technique of remote state preparation to provide an alternative as well as simpler proof, in the qubit case, given by Hardy and Song [3]. We generalize this result in d dimensional Hilbert space, where we show that the probabilistic exact cloning of $(d+1)$ number of states, in which d number of states are linearly independent, taken from a special ensemble of states, implies signalling.

It is an interesting property of $\mathcal{C}^2$ that the Bloch vectors corresponding to any three different states of a qubit say, $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle$, lie either on a great circle or a small circle of the Bloch sphere. Here it is to be mentioned that a small circle is defined as circle formed by intersection of any non-diametral plane and the Bloch sphere. Hence, given any three different states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle$ of $\mathcal{C}^2$, one can find an orthogonal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ of $\mathcal{C}^2$ (say), two positive numbers α_0, α_1 (say) with $\alpha_0^2 + \alpha_1^2 = 1$, and real numbers $\phi_{01}, \phi_{11}, \phi_{02}, \phi_{12}, \phi_{03}, \phi_{13}$, such that the above-mentioned three states can be expressed as $|\psi_k\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^1 \alpha_j e^{i\phi_{jk}} |j\rangle$, for $k = 1, 2, 3$. As $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle$

are different, therefore two copies of these three states, i.e., $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ of $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$, are linearly independent. Then one can construct a POVM by which one can distinguish any state unambiguously from these set of three states with non-zero probability (less than one) [7].

Now Alice wants to prepare one of the three different states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle$, which is the element of the ensemble, remotely at Bob's place, in which she encoded three different messages. So these three states can be expressed as $|\psi_k\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^1 \alpha_j e^{i\phi_{jk}} |j\rangle$, for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Alice can perform the remote state preparation by using an entangled state, $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=0}^1 \alpha_i |i\rangle_A \otimes |i\rangle_B$, shared between Alice and Bob, and communicating 1 cbit only [8, 9]. Here the orthogonal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is same as that used in the above-mentioned expressions for $|\psi_k\rangle$'s. We now assume that Bob has a $1 \rightarrow 2$ probabilistic quantum cloning machine (PQCM) by which he can exactly clone these three linearly dependent states probabilistically. Bob will apply his $1 \rightarrow 2$ PQCM on his particle, after Alice prepares the state at his place. Now we consider the case when Bob will be successful to make the exact clone of the state of his particle. In this case, the state of Bob will be one of the three states of $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2}$. Since these states are linearly independent, Bob can distinguish these states $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ probabilistically which, in turn, implies that Bob can probabilistically extract more than 1 cbit of classical information (i.e., decoding the above mentioned three messages) probabilistically, although Alice has spent 1 cbit during the remote state preparation. This implies (probabilistic) signalling. Thus we conclude that probabilistic exact cloning of linearly dependent states from $\mathcal{C}^2$ is not possible.

Now we extend our argument in general d dimensional Hilbert space, for the special kinds of ensemble. For a given vector $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d-1})$ where $\alpha_i > 0$, $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i^2 = 1$, we choose the ensemble as

$$S_{\vec{\alpha}} = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \alpha_j e^{i\phi_j} |j\rangle : (\phi_0, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_{d-1}) \in T^d \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $T^d \equiv T \times T \times \dots d$ times, and $T = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq x \leq 2\pi\}$.

First of all we check whether we can get d number of linearly independent states from this ensemble. To do

*Electronic address: sibasish@imsc.res.in

†Electronic address: gkar@imsc.res.in

‡Electronic address: skunkri'r@isical.ac.in

§Electronic address: anirb@imsc.res.in

this, let us first consider the case for $d = 3$. We choose three states from the ensemble of equation (1) for $d = 3$. They are

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_0\rangle &= \alpha_0|0\rangle + \alpha_1|1\rangle + \alpha_2|2\rangle, \\ |\psi_1\rangle &= \alpha_0 e^{i\phi_0}|0\rangle + \alpha_1 e^{i\phi_1}|1\rangle + \alpha_2 e^{i\phi_2}|2\rangle, \\ |\psi_2\rangle &= \alpha_0 e^{i\phi'_0}|0\rangle + \alpha_1 e^{i\phi'_1}|1\rangle + \alpha_2 e^{i\phi'_2}|2\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ are linearly independent iff

$$\lambda_0|\psi_0\rangle + \lambda_1|\psi_1\rangle + \lambda_2|\psi_2\rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

when and only when $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (0, 0, 0)$. From equation (2) and (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 e^{i\phi_0} + \lambda_2 e^{i\phi'_0} &= 0, \\ \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 e^{i\phi_1} + \lambda_2 e^{i\phi'_1} &= 0, \\ \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 e^{i\phi_2} + \lambda_2 e^{i\phi'_2} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus the three states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ will be linearly independent iff the determinant of the coefficient matrix of equation (4) must be non-zero, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & e^{i\phi_0} & e^{i\phi'_0} \\ 1 & e^{i\phi_1} & e^{i\phi'_1} \\ 1 & e^{i\phi_2} & e^{i\phi'_2} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0. \quad (5)$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i(\phi_1+\phi'_2)} - e^{i(\phi_1+\phi'_0)} - e^{i(\phi_0+\phi'_2)} \\ - e^{i(\phi_2+\phi'_1)} + e^{i(\phi_0+\phi'_1)} + e^{i(\phi_2+\phi'_0)} \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

So one can always choose the phases $\phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi'_0, \phi'_1, \phi'_2$, such that it will satisfy the equation (6). Thus the states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ are linearly independent for the correct choice of the phases satisfying equation (6). We can extend our argument for any arbitrary d dimensional Hilbert space. So we can conclude that one can always choose d number of linearly independent states from the ensemble of states given in equation (1).

Let us now choose $(d+1)$ number of states from the ensemble of states given in equation (1), in which d number of states are linearly independent. We now show that the two copies of each of these $(d+1)$ number of states are linearly independent. To prove this again we consider the case for $d = 3$. We choose four different states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ from the ensemble of state given in equation (1) for $d = 3$ in which $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ are linearly independent. Let we assume that two copy of each of these four state are not linearly independent. Then the state $|\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ can be written as the linear combination of the three states $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}$, *i.e.*,

$$|\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2} = \lambda_0|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2} + \lambda_1|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2} + \lambda_2|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2} \quad (7)$$

L.H.S of the equation (7) is a product state but R.H.S is an entangle state, because $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ are

linearly independent and at least two of $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ are non-zero. Thus the state $|\psi_3\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ can not be written as the linear combination of the states $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 2}$. Then the two copies of each of the states $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle$ are linearly independent. We can extend our argument for d dimensional Hilbert space. Thus we can conclude that two copies each of these $(d+1)$ number of states are linearly independent.

In order to extend our argument for general d dimension, let us assume that, Alice and Bob share an entangle state in two d -dimensional systems

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i |i\rangle_A \otimes |i\rangle_B, \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$, and $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i^2 = 1$. Alice can remotely prepare states from any given subset from the ensemble in equation (1) by using the entangled state given in equation (8) and communicating $\log_2 d$ cbits only[9]. Alice wants to prepare remotely (at Bob's place) one of the $(d+1)$ number of states in which d number of states are linearly independent, chosen from the ensemble given in equation (1). Now we assume that Bob has a $1 \rightarrow 2$ PQCM which can clone these $(d+1)$ number of states exactly. Bob will apply his $1 \rightarrow 2$ PQCM on his state after Alice prepare the state to him. Now we consider the case when Bob will be successful to make the exact clone of his state. Since two copies of each of these $(d+1)$ states are linearly independent (which we prove earlier), then Bob can distinguish his state probabilistically. So probabilistically Bob can extract more than $\log_2 d$ cbits of information from Alice's sent message ($\log_2 d$ cbits of information), by using his PQCM, which implies probabilistic signalling. Thus we can conclude that probabilistic exact cloning of linearly dependent states from the ensemble given in equation (1), implies (probabilistic) signalling.

Our argument would run for a most general set of $(d+1)$ number of linearly dependent states, among which any d number of states are linearly independent (which we denote by $|\chi_1\rangle, |\chi_2\rangle, \dots, |\chi_d\rangle$), if we could have found an unitary operator U , which takes $|\chi_k\rangle$ to an element $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \alpha_j e^{i\phi_{jk}} |j\rangle$ of $S_{\vec{\alpha}}$ (for given $\vec{\alpha}$) for $k = 1, 2, \dots, (d+1)$, when $|\chi_{(d+1)}\rangle$ is the $(d+1)$ th element of the above-mentioned linearly dependent set $|\chi_1\rangle, |\chi_2\rangle, \dots, |\chi_{d+1}\rangle$ [11]. This means that if the $(d+1)$ th state is given by $|\chi_{d+1}\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k |\chi_k\rangle$, ($\lambda_k \in \mathcal{C}$), then $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \alpha_j \{ \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k e^{i\phi_{jk}} \} |j\rangle$ must be an element of $S_{\vec{\alpha}}$, which, in turn implies that $\sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k e^{i\phi_{jk}} = e^{i\theta_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$ and θ_j 's are real numbers. This, in general, does not hold good for arbitrary choice of $|\chi_1\rangle, |\chi_2\rangle, \dots, |\chi_{d+1}\rangle$, even if such an U would exist.

Recently Zeng and Zhang [10] have shown that Alice can remotely (exactly) prepare any state of the form $|\chi\rangle = a_0|0\rangle + a_1|1\rangle + \dots + a_{(d-1)}|d-1\rangle$ (where a_i 's are all real coefficients, $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} a_i^2 = 1$, and $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots, |d-1\rangle\}$ is a fixed orthonormal basis of a d dimensional Hilbert

space) at Bob's place, using $\log_2 d$ amount of shared free ebit and $\log_2 d$ amount of classical communication from Alice to Bob, if and only if $d = 2$, or 4, or 8. So let us take d to be either 2, or 4, or 8. Let us now choose any $(d + 1)$ number of different linearly dependent normalized states $|\chi_j\rangle = a_{j0}|0\rangle + a_{j1}|1\rangle + \dots + a_{j(d-1)}|d-1\rangle$ (for $j = 1, 2, \dots, d+1$) states, each with real coefficients, and such that any d of them are linearly independent [12]. Then we run our above mentioned argument of $1 \rightarrow 2$ cloning of these $(d + 1)$ number of states. And so, having $\log_2 d$ cbits of classical communication, Bob can extract (probabilistically) $\log_2(d + 1)$ cbits of information, by probabilistically distinguishing the $(d + 1)$ number of linearly independent states $|\psi_j\rangle \otimes |\psi_j\rangle$ (for $j = 1, 2, \dots, d+1$) – a contradiction. Thus we see that probabilistic exact $1 \rightarrow 2$ cloning of any $(d + 1)$ number of different linearly dependent states of d dimensional Hilbert space (where any d among these $(d + 1)$ number of states are linearly independent), each with real amplitudes, implies probabilistic signalling, in the case when $d = 2$, or 4, or 8.

In conclusion, we have given here an alternative proof of the result of Hardy and Song [3] for the case of qubits. Hence no three different states of $\mathcal{C}^d$ can be

probabilistically exactly cloned. For states of $\mathcal{C}^d$, when $d > 2$, we have alternatively proved a partial result of ref. [3], namely, $(d + 1)$ number of linearly dependent states (of which any d number of states are linearly independent) taken from a special ensemble of $\mathcal{C}^d$, can not be probabilistically exactly cloned. Although our method does not reproduce the results of ref. [3], in full generality, our approach seems to be comparatively simpler. We loose here the generality of the argument because of the fact that an arbitrarily given set of states of $\mathcal{C}^d$ can not be remotely prepared (not in asymptotic sense) with $\log_2 d$ cbits of classical communication.

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank R. Simon and P. S. Joag for interesting discussions. Authors are also thankful to A. K. Pati for useful discussions, in particular, about the work [10]. S. K. acknowledges the support by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Government of India, New Delhi. S. K. also acknowledges the support of The Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, for their hospitality, during the work.

-
- [1] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982);
 - [2] L. -M. Duan and G. -C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4999 (1998);
 - [3] L. Hardy and D. D. Song, *Phys. Lett. A* **259**, 331 (1999);
 - [4] A. K. Pati, *Phys. Lett. A* **270**, 103 (2000);
 - [5] In fact, in order to show that 2 bit of classical information from Alice to Bob is necessary in teleporting exactly an arbitrary qubit from Alice's place to Bob's place, Bennett et. al., in ref. [6], have used the same kind of argument of signalling, as we have used in this paper.
 - [6] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Josza, A. Peres, and W.K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993);
 - [7] A. Peres and D. R. Terno, *J. Phys. A:Math. Gen.* **31**, 7105 (1998);
 - [8] A. K. Pati, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 014302 (2000);
 - [9] M. -Yong Ye, Y. -Sheng Zhang, G. -Can Guo, quant-ph/0307027 (2003);
 - [10] Bei Zeng, and Peng Zhang *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 022316 (2002);
 - [11] Such an U does not always exist.
 - [12] Such kind of choice of $(d + 1)$ number of states $|\chi_j\rangle$'s can, in general, be made.